# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN RE: PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY	
AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICE LITIGATION	

MDL No. 1456 Master File: 1:01-CV-12257-PBS

Sub-Category: 1:06-CV-11883-PBS

......

Hon. Patti B. Saris

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

State of South Carolina – State Medicaid Case

### **STATUS REPORT**

Pursuant to the Court's June 16, 2004 Procedural Order, Plaintiff the State of South Carolina, by and through the State Medicaid Plan, hereby submits the following status report.

/s/ William E. Hopkins, Jr.

BEASLEY, ALLEN, CROW, METHVIN, PORTIS & MILES, PC

William E. Hopkins, Jr. W. Daniel Miles, III Post Office Box 4160 Montgomery, Alabama 36103-4160 (334) 269-2343

HENRY D. McMASTER Attorney General JOHN W. McINTOSH Chief Deputy Attorney General C. HAVIRD JONES, JR. Senior Assistant Attorney General Post Office Box 11549 Columbia, South Carolina 29211 (803) 734-3970

#### STROM LAW FIRM, LLC

J. Preston Strom, Jr. Mario A. Pacella 2110 Beltline Blvd., Suite A Columbia, South Carolina 29204 (803) 252-4800

# MIKE KELLY LAW GROUP, LLC

D. Michael Kelly Post Office Box 8113 Columbia, South Carolina 29202 (803) 726-0123

## **SCHMUTZ & SCHMUTZ**

Joseph Stephen Schmutz 24 Broad Street Charleston, South Carolina 29401 (843) 577-5530

#### **OF COUNSEL:**

# MINER, BARNHILL &GALLAND, PC

Charles Barnhill 44 East Mifflin Street, Suite 803 Madison, Wisconsin 53703 (608) 255-5200

P. Jeffrey Archibald 1914 Monroe Street Madison, Wisconsin 53711 (608) 661-8855

MDL 1456 Status Chart – South Carolina Medicaid Case				
Case Name	MDL Docket No.	Original Jurisdiction	<u>Status</u>	
State of SC v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc.	1:06-CV-11883-PBS	Removed to District of South Carolina	<ul> <li>The parties are coordinating discovery efforts with related cases brought by plaintiff against other drug manufacturers currently pending in South Carolina state court.</li> <li>Discovery is ongoing.</li> <li>Depositions of State witnesses have been progressing.</li> <li>Plaintiff has been making document productions on a rolling basis.</li> <li>On January 18,</li> </ul>	

T	
	2012, the state court heard
	further arguments
	regarding the remaining
	"internal" documents
	contained on the Attorney
	General's Privilege Log
	and a Motion to Compel
	Production of Certain
	Data from Medco. The
	state court took the
	matters under advisement.
	At the hearing, the state
	court signed an order
	extending the existing
	scheduling order in these
	cases by six months (fact
	discovery to close by
	September 2012).
	• On January 24,
	2012, the Court denied
	plaintiff's motion to
	remand this case to the
	federal court in South
	Carolina.
	• On January 27,
	2012, the Court extended
	the fact discovery deadline
	the fact discovery deadline to September 14, 2012.
	to September 14, 2012,
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court in other AWP-related
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court in other AWP-related matters and plaintiff may
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court in other AWP-related matters and plaintiff may renew its motion to
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court in other AWP-related matters and plaintiff may renew its motion to remand this action to the
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court in other AWP-related matters and plaintiff may renew its motion to remand this action to the federal district court in
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court in other AWP-related matters and plaintiff may renew its motion to remand this action to the
	to September 14, 2012, which matches the fact discovery cut-off in the state court cases.  • Following a February 22, 2012 status conference with this Court, the Court agreed that on or after September 17, 2012, Abbott may file a motion for summary judgment based on the "yardstick" test developed and applied by this Court in other AWP-related matters and plaintiff may renew its motion to remand this action to the federal district court in

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned employee of Beasley, Allen, Crow, Methvin, Portis & Miles, P.C., do hereby certify that on the 1st day of August, 2012, a true and complete copy of the foregoing was served via electronic service pursuant to the Case Management Order by sending a copy to LexisNexis File & Serve for posting and notification to all counsel of record.

/s/ William E. Hopkins, Jr.
William E. Hopkins, Jr.